



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,836	08/31/2001	Daniel Keele Burgin	1160215/0531072	3316
26874	7590	12/15/2005	EXAMINER	
FROST BROWN TODD, LLC 2200 PNC CENTER 201 E. FIFTH STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202			TRAN, MYLINH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/944,836

Applicant(s)

BURGIN ET AL.

Examiner

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-20,22-25,27,28,30 and 32-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-20,22-25,27,28,30 and 32-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/24/05.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 10/24/05 has been entered and carefully considered.

However, the limitations of the amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record and newly discovered prior art, therefore, claims 1-7, 9-20, 22-25, 27-28, 30 and 32-39 are rejected under the new ground of rejection as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-20, 22-25, 27-28, 30 and 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zellner et al. [US. 2004/0088345] in view of Reisman [US. 6,658,464].

As to claims 1, 13, 19, 20, 25, 30 and 36, Zellner et al. discloses a computer implemented method and corresponding apparatus for operating a browser associated with an end-user comprising the steps/means for receiving a request for end-user support, wherein the request is received at a support location that is remote relative to the end-user (page 9, lines 0074, "the support service provider (SSP) 18 forwards an emergency help request message from the IP device to the emergency help request"); determining a present navigation location for the

end-user (page 3, 0031); retrieving content from a content provider that corresponds to the determined present navigation location, wherein the content is retrieved from a content location that is remote relative to the end-user (page 3, 0037);

wherein the retrieved content includes an embedded navigation link associated with a first domain, wherein the first domain is remote relative to the end-user, wherein the first domain is associated with the content location (page 3, 0079, "the support service provider (SSP) 18 forwards an emergency help request message from the IP device to the emergency help request");

providing a modified content to the end user, wherein the modified content includes a portion of the retrieved content and includes the encoding of the embedded navigation link that replaced the embedded navigation link, wherein the encoded embedded navigation link continues to be actually associated with the first domain despite the appearance that the encoded embedded navigation link is associated with the second domain (page 9, 0074, "the support service provider (SSP) 18 forwards an emergency help request message from the IP device 20 to the emergency service center 12. The SS18 acts as an intermediary (third party) that first receives the emergency requesting message from the IP device 20 over the Internet 22.");

providing the end-user support to the end-user, wherein the end-user support is provided from the support location via the second domain (page 3, 0031);

wherein at least a representation of the modified content and the end-user support are simultaneously viewable by the end-user (page 9, 0075-0077);
a data collection module in communication with the end-user support knowledge database, the automated support server, and the secondary support system, wherein the data collection module records a set of data related to an actual end-user support session between the end-user and one or both of the automated support server and the secondary support system, wherein the data collection module is configured to provide updated information to the knowledge database, wherein the updated information relates to the actual end-user support session (page 6, 0057-0058).

Zellner et al. fail to teach or suggest encoding the present navigation location; encoding the embedded navigation link so that it appears to be associated with a second domain, wherein the second domain is remote relative to the end-user, wherein the second domain is associated with the support location and replacing the embedded navigation link included in the retrieved content with the encoding of the embedded navigation link.

However, Reisman teaches these features at column 39, lines 30-47 and column 40, lines 59-67 and column 42, lines 31-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the Reisman's teachings with the teachings of Zellner et al. Motivation would have been to provide the end user with an interactive and intelligent support session.

As to claim 2, Zellner et al. fails to clearly teach identifying the embedded navigation link. However, Reisman discloses identifying the embedded navigation link at column 48, lines 12-38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of the embedded navigation link with the teaching of Zellner. Motivation of the combination would have been to help the end user to locate the navigation link.

As to claim 3, Zellner et al. teach the retrieved content being provided in a first frame of a browser window and the end-user support is provided in a second frame of the browser window, and wherein the first frame and the second frame are simultaneously displayable within the browser window (page 9, 0076-0078).

As to claim 4, Zellner et al. also teach receiving at the first frame a notice of a navigation event that occurred at the second frame (page 9, 0076).

As to claim 5, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach receiving an indication that the embedded navigation link has been selected by the end-user. However, Reisman shows receiving an indication that the embedded navigation link has been selected by the end-user (column 48, lines 10-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of the indication to Zellner. Motivation of the combination would have been to help the end user to locate the navigation link.

As to claim 6, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach decoding the embedded navigation link, passing the decoded embedded navigation link to the content provider, receiving content corresponding to the decoded embedded navigation link and

providing the received content to the end user. However, Reisman discloses decoding the embedded navigation link (column 47, line 18 through column 48, line 39); passing the decoded embedded navigation link to the content provider (column 45, lines 23-65); receiving content corresponding to the decoded embedded navigation link (column 48, lines 10-45); and providing the received content to the end-user (column 47, lines 18-40). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching to Zellner. Motivation of the combination would have been to help the end user to locate the navigation link.

As to claim 7, Zellner et al. provide providing automated end-user support (page 3, 0031).

As to claim 9, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach masking one of the first transport protocol and the second transport protocol so that content associated with the embedded navigation link and the end-user support appears to be subject to the same transport protocol. However, Reisman demonstrates masking one of the first transport protocol and the second transport protocol so that content associated with the embedded navigation link and the end-user support appears to be subject to the same transport protocol (column 21, line 35 through column 22, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of the masking Zellner et al. Motivation of the combination would have been to have both the automated agent

and the content provider can appear simultaneously within a single browser frame set.

As to claim 10, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach providing the second navigation link to the end-user without encoding. However, Reisman also demonstrates providing the second navigation link to the end-user without encoding (column 47, lines 18-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of the second navigation link to Zellner et al. Motivation of the combination would have been to help the end user to locate the navigation link.

As to claim 11, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach passing the second navigation link directly to an associated content provider responsive to selection of the second navigation link by the end-user. However, Reisman discloses passing the second navigation link directly to an associated content provider responsive to selection of the second navigation link by the end-user (column 47, line 40 through column 48, line 40). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of the second navigation link to Zellner et al. Motivation of the combination would have been to help the end user to locate the navigation link.

As to claim 12, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach forwarding the second navigation link to an associated content provider responsive to selection of the second navigation link by the end-user. However, Reisman also discloses providing the second navigation link comprising: forwarding the second navigation link to an

associated content provider responsive to selection of the second navigation link by the end-user (column 49, line 46 through column 50, line 15). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching to Zellner et al. Motivation of the combination would have been to help the end user to locate the navigation link.

As to claim 14, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach the common domain being a third domain. However, Reisman teaches the common domain being a third domain (column 42, line 30 through column 43, line 24). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of third domain to Zellner et al. Motivation of the combination would have been circumvent the consistent page domain security requirement.

As to claims 15 and 16, Zellner et al. also teach the automated support system comprising a profiler application and a roles module; and a skills module in communication with the roles module (page 6, 0055).

As to claim 17, Zellner et al. show the automated support system comprising a resource data module (page 6, 0055).

As to claim 18, Zellner et al. also show a dialogue module and a social skill module (page 7, 0061-0062).

As to claims 22 and 27, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach receiving a request for end-user support and determining a present navigation location associated with the browser, Reisman teaches passing a fetch request to the content provider for data related to the present navigation location. However, Reisman teaches

passing a fetch request to the content provider for data related to the present navigation location (column 5, lines 10-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of a request for end-user support to Zellner et al. Motivation of the combination would have been to help the end user to locate the navigation link. As to claims 23 and 28, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach providing for display in the browser window an interactive content; wherein the interactive content originates from a second domain. However, Reisman provides providing for display in the browser window an interactive content; wherein the interactive content originates from a second domain (column 34, line 39 through column 35, line 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of displaying in the browser window an interactive content to Zellner et al. Motivation of the combination would have been circumvent the consistent page domain security requirement.

As to claim 24, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach encoding the first of the plurality of links so that it appears to have originated from the second domain. However, Reisman provides encoding the first of the plurality of links so that it appears to have originated from the second domain (column 36, line 60 through column 37, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching to Zellner et al. Motivation of

the combination would have been circumvent the consistent page domain security requirement.

As to claims 32 and 37, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach a report and analysis module in communication with the end-user support knowledge database.

However, Reisman demonstrates a report and analysis module in communication with the end-user support knowledge database (column 6, lines 39-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of a report to Zellner et al. Motivation of the combination would have been to provide the end user with an interactive and intelligent support session.

As to claims 33 and 38, Zellner et al. fail to clearly teach an annotation server in communication with the automated support server. However, Reisman also demonstrates an annotation server in communication with the automated support server (column 7, lines 30-65). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Reisman's teaching of an annotation server to Zellner. Motivation of the combination would have been to provide the end user with an interactive and intelligent support session.

As to claims 34 and 39, Zellner et al. disclose a content provider in communication with the automated support server (page 7, 0061-0062).

As to claim 35, Zellner et al. also disclose the secondary support system comprising a live support system (page 7, 0062).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 13, 19, 20, 25, 30 and 36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

